

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/070,356 | VANGBO, HAKAN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Barbara J. Musser | 1733 | |

All Participants:

(1) Barbara J. Musser.

(2) Ralph Dowell.

Date of Interview: 30 September 2004

Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner suggested the claims be re-written to remove 112, 2nd problems and ambiguities in the claims. Applicant submitted an amendment to that effect which was attached to the office action as an examiner's amendment.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview *in the Notice of Allowability. above*

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)